

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 26, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 30-33 and 44-59 are rejected. Claims 30, 50 and 56 have been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Examiner Interview – April 26, 2007

A telephonic interview was held on April 26, 2007. The Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for his time. During the interview, a brief background was provided and the art of record as applied to Claim 30 was discussed. An agreement as to allowability was not reached. Applicants agreed to further amend the claims to clarify the invention.

Claim Rejections

Claims 30-33, 44-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 30-33 and 44-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. The Applicants have amended these claims to address the rejection and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 30-33, 44-45 and 49-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaiser (US 6,060,996) in view of Gaskill (US 5,301,358) and Gaskill (US 4,713,808). Claims 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Kaiser

in view of Gaskill and further in view of Chadwick (US 5,168,271). In order to expedite the prosecution of this matter, the Applicants have amended the Independent Claims.

As amended, claim 30 recites in part “locally formatting the transmitted data for local-area wireless transmission; wherein locally formatting the transmitted data includes encoding the transmitted data at a data encoder when retransmitting using a first transmission speed and bypassing the data encoder when retransmitting using a second transmission speed.” In contrast, Kaiser extracts data from a received signal for processing rather than encoding data onto a signal for transmission. With regard to Claim 30, the Office Action states that Kaiser discloses “locally formatting said transmitted data for local-area wireless transmission (see col. 5, lines 17-37).” Referring to figure 4, and column 5, lines 5-15, Kaiser teaches that “[p]ager 110 receives pages on antenna 400. An RF line from antenna 400 is provided to RF front and 402 which reduces the RF signal to an intermediate system (IF) signal based on the carrier frequency provided by a local oscillator 404. The IF signal is provided as an input to an IF demodulator 406, which outputs a base band 100 kHz. That signal is coupled to a switch 408 which either routes the base band signal to a SWIFT demodulator 410 for an MBS demodulator 412. The output of these two demodulators are provided to a microcontroller 420, which controls switch 408, as well as setting the station frequency for local oscillator 404 and providing data at an output 422.” Stated another way, Kaiser teaches that a signal is received at an antenna 400 and is demodulated by various demodulators. Data is then extracted from the demodulated signal. The extracted data is provided at output 422. Thus, the system taught by Kaiser extracts data from a received signal for processing rather than locally formatting the data and encoding the data onto a signal for transmission. Since Kaiser does not teach locally formatting the transmitted data for local-area

wireless transmission; wherein locally formatting the transmitted data includes encoding the transmitted data at a data encoder when retransmitting using a first transmission speed and bypassing the data encoder when retransmitting using a second transmission speed, Claim 30 is proposed to be allowable.

As amended, Claim 50 recites in part “locally formatting the broadcast data for local-area wireless transmission, including encoding the broadcast data at a data encoder when the locally formatted data is to be retransmitted using a first transmission speed mode and bypassing the data encoder when the locally formatted data is to be retransmitted using a second transmission speed mode.” For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 50 is proposed to be allowable.

As amended, Claim 56 recites in part “a localcast transmitter that is arranged to receive the broadcast data and locally format the broadcast data for local-area wireless transmission, including encoding the broadcast data at a data encoder before the localcast transmitter transmits the locally formatted data using a first transmission speed mode, and bypassing the data encoder when the localcast transmitter transmits the locally formatted data in a second transmission speed mode.” For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 56 is proposed to be allowable.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application,

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

